



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY  
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

DATE: APRIL 28, 2016

PREPARED BY: SA [REDACTED]

CASE #: OI-AR-2013-ADM-0068

CROSS REFERENCE #:

TITLE: [REDACTED], GS-14, [REDACTED], OFFICE OF RADIATION AND  
INDOOR AIR

CASE CLOSING REPORT

Subject(s)	Location	Other Data
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	

**POTENTIAL VIOLATION(S):** Misuse of Government Equipment, Inappropriate Conduct at Work, Misuse of Official Time in violation of Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Order CIO 2102.0, *Policy on Limited Personal Use of Government Equipment*, (April 2, 2004)(Tab B).

**ALLEGATION(S):** [REDACTED] Office of Radiation and Indoor Air (ORIA) downloaded and viewed pornographic images on his EPA laptop while at work.

**FINDING:** The allegation that [REDACTED] downloaded and viewed pornographic images on his EPA computer while at work is supported.

On March 10, 2015, the United States Attorney's Office for the District of Columbia declined federal prosecution of [REDACTED].

On March 13, 2015, the OIG provided EPA senior leadership with a final summary memorandum report for this investigation. On March 24, 2015, [REDACTED] informed the OIG that the EPA had submitted a letter of proposed removal to [REDACTED] due to the OIG's investigation.

[REDACTED] retired from federal service effective [REDACTED], 2015

**DISPOSITION:** Since this case has been criminally declined and there is no administrative nexus, this case is closed with no further action. However, if additional information is obtained, OI will assess such information and take appropriate action.



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY  
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

DATE: MARCH 15, 2016

PREPARED BY: SA [REDACTED]

CASE #: OI-HQ-2014-ADM-0057

CROSS REFERENCE #:

TITLE: [REDACTED], GS-13, CRIMINAL INVESTIGATOR, CRIMINAL  
INVESTIGATIONS BRANCH

CASE CLOSING REPORT

Subject(s)	Location	Other Data
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	

**BACKGROUND:**

On [REDACTED] 2014 Special Agent (SA) [REDACTED], United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Office of Inspector General (OIG), Office of Investigations (OI), Office of Inspector General (OIG), received a forwarded message from [REDACTED] Office to [REDACTED], EPA Criminal Investigations Division (CID), [REDACTED] CID which outlined possible employee misconduct by [REDACTED] CID agent.

Specifically, [REDACTED] alleges that SA [REDACTED], EPA, CID, [REDACTED] made a statement to the effect of "I don't see what the big deal is, I have a kit on my truck" during the search of [REDACTED] business. Agent's note: The search being conducted of the business is related to the removal of catalytic converters and the instillation of Exhaust Gas Recirculation (EGR) "kits" in violation of [REDACTED] State environmental and/or vehicle emission laws.

**VIOLATION:**

1. 18 USC 4 – Misprision of felony.

**ALLEGATION:**

SA [REDACTED] possessed a vehicle with an EGR kit or modified ECS

**FINDINGS:**

Unsupported. An inspection of SA [REDACTED]'s personal vehicle produced no evidence that there was an EGR kit or any ESC modifications.

**DISPOSITON:**

On [REDACTED] 2014, after being briefed [REDACTED], AUSA, [REDACTED], declined to accept the matter for prosecution.

On [REDACTED], 2016, OIG Agents confirmed with [REDACTED] Professional Integrity and Quality Assurance (PIQA), Office of Criminal Enforcement and Training (OCEFT), EPA, that CID management took no administrative action against [REDACTED], due to the findings of the investigation being unfounded. [REDACTED] has since left the agency. [REDACTED]'s leaving was not part of any administrative action and was the result of finding new employment.

Based upon the foregoing, there are no further investigative steps to be taken and this case is recommended for closure.



**UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY  
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL**

TWO POTOMAC YARD  
2733 SOUTH CRYSTAL DRIVE  
ARLINGTON, VA 22202

**DATE:** March 3, 2016

**PREPARED BY:** [REDACTED]

**CASE #:** OI-HQ-2014-ADM-0097

**CROSS REFERENCE #:**

**TITLE:** Missing Firearm

**CASE CLOSING REPORT**

Subject(s)	Location	Other Data
Unknown	EPA	

**ALLEGATIONS:** On Tuesday June 17, 2014, Assistant Inspector General for Investigations (AIGI) Patrick Sullivan, Office of Investigation (OI), Office of Inspector General (OIG), EPA, was contacted by [REDACTED] Securities and Management Division (SMD) Office of Acquisition (OA), Office of Administration and Resources Management (OARM) regarding a missing Firearm. Specifically, [REDACTED] with [REDACTED] Security reported on Tuesday June 17, 2014 at 2:30 AM that a Glock 17 9mm with 51 rounds and a can of Oleoresin Capsicum spray went missing from the guard control room located in the William Jefferson Clinton Building [REDACTED].

**INVESTIGATIVE FINDINGS:**

On September 26, 2014, the OIG distributed a letter offering a reward of up to \$1,000.00 for information leading to the successful recovery of the firearm. To date, the OIG has not received any leads from the letter.

From June 19, 2014 through June 27, 2014, four (4) [REDACTED] Security [REDACTED], and the last known person who was assigned the firearm) were interviewed by EPA-OIG special agents. The results of the interviews were negative in providing and substantive leads as to the whereabouts of the firearm.

From February 25, 2015 through February 27, 2015, special agents conducted questionnaires on roughly Sixty (60) [REDACTED] in order to narrow down potential subjects for polygraph examinations. On May 27, 2015, a polygraph examination was conducted on [REDACTED]. The results of

**RESTRICTED INFORMATION**

the polygraph examination were negative in producing any leads that would assist in determining the whereabouts of the missing firearm.

**DISPOSITION:** All investigative leads for this case have been exhausted. On account of these leads resulting in an insufficient amount of evidence and the length of time since the theft occurred. It is the opinion of this office that any further investigation is not in the best interest of the government. Therefore, this case is being closed with no further action. If new information becomes available that would otherwise change the aforementioned opinion, this case will be reopened and investigative action will be conducted as appropriate.



**UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY  
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL**

**DATE:** SEPTEMBER 22, 2015

**PREPARED BY:** SA [REDACTED]

**CASE #:** OI-HQ-2014-ADM-0109

**CROSS REFERENCE #:**

**TITLE:** JUTRO, PETER, SES, ACTING ASSOCIATE ADMINISTRATOR, EPA OFFICE OF HOMELAND SECURITY

**CASE CLOSING REPORT**

Subject(s)	Location	Other Data
JUTRO, PETER; [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]	WASHINGTON, D.C.	

**VIOLATION:**

1. EPA ORDER 3120.1; Conduct & Discipline Manual, Appendix – Table of Penalties #7: Conduct which is generally criminal, infamous, dishonest, immoral or notoriously disgraceful.
2. EPA ORDER 3120.1; Conduct & Discipline Manual, Appendix – Table of Penalties #32: Sexual harassment of EPA employees.
3. EPA Guidelines for Visitors and Groups.
4. Executive Order 10450, Section 8-Security Requirements for Government Employment.
5. Executive Order 13526, Section 4.1-Classified National Security Information.
6. EPA Anti-Harassment Policy, <http://intranet.epa.gov/civilrights/antiharassment-policy.htm>
7. Principle Number 11 of the Standards of Ethical Conduct for Employees of the Executive Branch, 5 C.F.R. Part 2635
8. Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended.

**ALLEGATION:**

1. From July 16 to July 30, 2014, Peter Jutro, Acting Associate Administrator (Acting AA), Office of Homeland Security, engaged in a series of interactions, including conduct and verbal exchanges of a sexual nature, involving a twenty-one (21) year old female intern from [REDACTED] who reported the interactions to her supervisor at the [REDACTED] and indicated that she was “uncomfortable and scared” by their interactions (Victim 1).



2. In addition to actions directed at Victim 1, from 2004 through July 2014, Jutro engaged in conduct and exchanges, including some of a sexual nature, considered to be unwelcome by sixteen (16) additional females.
3. Jutro was not in compliance with building entry security procedures.
4. Jutro discussed classified information in violation of safeguarding and access restriction requirements either in an unsecure location or in a careless manner.
5. Whether a lack of due diligence by senior level officials at EPA in responding to earlier claims of unwelcome conduct and verbal exchanges, including some of a sexual nature, violated any mandate to take action, thereby resulting in additional women being subjected to inappropriate behavior by Jutro from January 2014 to July 30, 2014.

#### **FINDINGS:**

The investigation substantiated that from July 16 to July 30, 2014, Jutro engaged in a series of interactions, including some of a sexual nature, involving Victim 1 who reported the interactions to her supervisor at [REDACTED] and indicated that she was “uncomfortable and scared” by their interactions. Additionally, the investigation substantiated that from 2004 through July 2014, Jutro engaged in conduct and exchanges, including some of a sexual nature, considered to be unwelcome by sixteen (16) additional females. For the third allegation, the investigation substantiated that Jutro was not in compliance with building entry security procedures by bypassing the security checkpoint with Victim 1 and not having her sign in as a visitor. For the fourth allegation, the investigation determined that the allegation that Jutro discussed classified information in violation of federal requirements for safeguarding and restricting access to classified information was unsubstantiated.

Lastly, the investigation substantiated that senior level officials at EPA received information regarding multiple claims of unwelcome conduct and verbal exchanges by Jutro. The investigation further substantiated that those officials did not take any action against Jutro as a result of receiving this information about Jutro. Subsequent to these officials receiving information about the actions by Jutro, six additional (6) women were subjected to behavior they felt was inappropriate by Jutro. Specifically, [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] were advised prior to or immediately following Jutro’s selection as Acting AA for OHS , in February 2014 that Jutro exhibited inappropriate behavior toward women. [REDACTED] reported this information to the other senior level officials, but none of the others took any action. On February 23, 2014, Jutro was designated the Acting AA for OHS until he was placed on paid administrative leave on August 4, 2014.

As discussed in the second Report of Investigation, the OIG examined whether there was any requirement that the senior officials who were made aware of Jutro’s actions had a duty to take any specific action as a result of that knowledge, including reporting that information to OIG. In particular, the OIG examined whether their inaction violated any ethical regulations or the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, or breached the EPA’s anti-harassment policy. The investigation did not substantiate a violation of any duty by any of these senior officials to act on the information they had received regarding Jutro. However, OIG’s investigation was negatively

impacted and delayed due to the fact that these senior level officials did not notify OIG about their knowledge of other incidents of Jutro's inappropriate behavior toward women.

**DISPOSITON:**

On March 4, 2015 and April 24, 2015, EPA OIG issued two Report of Investigation regarding this investigation to Stan Meiburg (Meiburg), Acting Deputy Administrator.

As a result of OIG's ongoing investigation into employee misconduct by Jutro, Jutro retired from Federal service on January 9, 2015. No administrative action was taken against Jutro prior to his retirement from Federal service.

On July 14, 2015, Meiburg sent email to Patrick Sullivan, Assistant Inspector General for Investigations, responding to the second Report of Investigation for this investigation. Meiburg states that he disagreed with the findings in the second ROI and provides no evidence to suggest that administrative action will be taken based upon the OIG findings for this report.

Based upon the foregoing, there are no further investigative steps to be taken and this case is recommended for closure.





UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY  
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

DATE: December 4, 2015

PREPARED BY: [REDACTED]

CASE #: OI-HQ-2015-ADM-0096

CROSS REFERENCE #: N/A

TITLE: [REDACTED], SPECIAL AGENT EPA OIG, GS-13

CASE CLOSING REPORT

Subject(s)	Location	Other Data
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	N/A

VIOLATIONS:

Resource Management Directive Systems 2550B Official Travel - Section VIII EPA Appendices A

ALLEGATION:

On July 9, 2015, Assistant Inspector General for Investigations Patrick Sullivan, United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Office of Inspector General (OIG), received information that Special Agent (SA) [REDACTED], EPA OIG, allegedly misused [REDACTED] government issued travel credit card. The documentation disclosed three automated cash disbursements on June [REDACTED] 2015, in the amounts of \$83, \$123, and \$163 dollars, from the Wells Fargo Bank [REDACTED]. Preliminary information regarding SA [REDACTED]'s official travel indicated [REDACTED] was not on duty travel while in [REDACTED]. Further analysis of the transactions identified another questionable charge for a stay at [REDACTED] on December [REDACTED] 2012.

FINDINGS:

On July 21, 2015, SA [REDACTED] was interviewed concerning the use of [REDACTED] travel card while on non-Government travel, specifically the ATM withdrawals made in [REDACTED] in June 2015. SA [REDACTED] confirmed [REDACTED] was in [REDACTED] on a personal vacation. SA [REDACTED] stated when [REDACTED] arrived at the airport in the evening of June [REDACTED] 2015 for [REDACTED] flight home, [REDACTED] learned [REDACTED] flight had been canceled. [REDACTED] was placed on stand by for a 2 am flight to [REDACTED], but the airline could not guarantee a connection to the [REDACTED]. When the 2 am flight did not come to fruition, SA [REDACTED] was then placed on a direct flight to [REDACTED] Airport which left at 8 am.

SA [REDACTED] stated [REDACTED] did not have any more cash on [REDACTED]. SA [REDACTED] added [REDACTED] personal credit card, a [REDACTED] card, did not allow cash advances and [REDACTED] felt it was at its maximum credit limit. SA [REDACTED] stated [REDACTED] had used up [REDACTED] ATM withdrawal limit for the day on [REDACTED] ATM card.

SA [REDACTED] stated [REDACTED] then took money out of the ATM at the airport using [REDACTED] government credit card. SA [REDACTED] stated [REDACTED] thought [REDACTED] might need the money for a hotel room, transportation to and from the hotel and for meals.

SA [REDACTED] stated when [REDACTED] got back in the office the next day, [REDACTED] told [REDACTED] supervisor [REDACTED], EPA OIG [REDACTED] that [REDACTED] had used [REDACTED] government credit card at the ATM for cash. SA [REDACTED] stated [REDACTED] then paid the government credit card balance immediately.

On July 21, 2015, [REDACTED] was interviewed and advised [REDACTED] spoke to SA [REDACTED] upon [REDACTED] return to the office and inquired about [REDACTED] trip. SA [REDACTED] reportedly stated [REDACTED] had used the Government travel card while in [REDACTED] (on personal business). [REDACTED] advised SA [REDACTED] told [REDACTED] was stranded at the airport and ran out of money. When asked the amount of the cash advance obtained with the Government travel card, [REDACTED] reportedly replied about \$80.00. [REDACTED] gave SA [REDACTED] "oral counseling" and told [REDACTED] what [REDACTED] did was wrong and that [REDACTED] should not do it again. [REDACTED] was aware of one transaction but not three transactions. [REDACTED] had known (b) (5)

(b) (5), (b) (6), (b) (7)(C)

Based on the questionable charge for a stay for [REDACTED] on December [REDACTED] 2012, OI conducted a review of SA [REDACTED]'s travel records for the period January 1, 2012 through June 30, 2015. In addition to the questionable charge at [REDACTED] the review identified multiple charges for [REDACTED] along with corresponding credits.

On October 15, 2015, SA [REDACTED] was interviewed relative to the results from the review of [REDACTED] travel records. SA [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] profile had [REDACTED] Government credit card number linked to it. SA [REDACTED] stated [REDACTED] believed the hotel charged [REDACTED] Government credit card instead of [REDACTED] personal credit card. SA [REDACTED] added that [REDACTED] did not realize this when [REDACTED] checked in. [REDACTED] added that [REDACTED] SA [REDACTED] reiterated that it was a personal trip and [REDACTED] was not on temporary duty (TDY). SA [REDACTED] stated there would have been other charges to [REDACTED] Government credit card at that time if [REDACTED] was TDY. [REDACTED] stated once again to the best of [REDACTED] recollection [REDACTED] was not TDY. SA [REDACTED] stated [REDACTED] had forgotten about the [REDACTED] charge when previously interviewed by OI. During that interview [REDACTED] stated [REDACTED] had never used [REDACTED] government credit card improperly before. SA [REDACTED] stated [REDACTED] forgot about [REDACTED] charge until now as the conversation with the interviewing agents had refreshed [REDACTED] recollection.

SA [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] Government credit card was linked to [REDACTED] profile. SA [REDACTED] advised that [REDACTED] has since de-linked everything from [REDACTED] Government credit card.

SA [REDACTED] advised [REDACTED] informed [REDACTED] that [REDACTED] misused [REDACTED] Government credit card while in [REDACTED] in June 2015. However, [REDACTED] did not tell [REDACTED] there were three separate transactions (withdrawals).

**DISPOSITION:**

A Management Inquiry was completed on October 30, 2015 which substantiated the allegation that SA [REDACTED] misused [REDACTED] government issued travel credit card. As a result, oral counseling was provided to SA [REDACTED]. A Memorandum of Counseling was prepared and dated November 17, 2015 and signed by SA [REDACTED] on November 20, 2015. Due to the administrative nature of the allegation, this matter was not presented for criminal and/or civil prosecution/remedies. As such, this investigation will be closed at this time.



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY  
OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

DATE: SEPTEMBER 10, 2015

PREPARED BY: [REDACTED]

CASE #: OI-HQ-2015-ADM-0097

CROSS REFERENCE #:

TITLE: [REDACTED] CRIMINAL INVESTIGATOR, [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED] OFFICE OF INVESTIGATIONS, OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

CASE CLOSING REPORT

Subject(s)	Location	Other Data
[REDACTED]	WASHINGTON, DC	

**VIOLATION:** Firearms Safety and Security Standards, OIG Procedure 204, Section 1.10

**ALLEGATION:** Subject left [REDACTED] service weapon unattended in a stall in the [REDACTED] restroom at William Jefferson Clinton (WJC) building West Room [REDACTED].

**FINDINGS:** On March 17, 2015, Subject was interviewed concerning leaving [REDACTED] duty weapon in the [REDACTED] restroom. During the interview the Subject admitted that [REDACTED] left [REDACTED] duty weapon unattended in a [REDACTED] bathroom stall located WJC West Room [REDACTED] and the Subject stated that there was not excuse for what happened.

**DISPOSITION:** A Management Inquiry was completed on May 9, 2015 that substantiated the allegation that the Subject left [REDACTED] duty weapon unattended in a [REDACTED] bathroom located in WJC West Room [REDACTED]. As a result, a Notice of Proposed Suspension was provided to the Subject on May 27, 2015 with a recommendation of (b) (5) [REDACTED]. As the deciding official, Assistant Inspector General for Investigations Patrick Sullivan, issued a Notice of Decision on Proposed Suspension to the Subject on July 21, 2015 (b) (5) [REDACTED] one (1) day suspension based upon the Douglas Factors and other information that was provided by the Subject. The Subject served the one (1) suspension on July 27, 2015.